REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-29 remain pending in the present application, Claims 1, 6, 9, 16, 20, and 24 having been amended to more clearly define the present invention, and Claim 5 having been previously cancelled.

Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 5 [sic] and 6-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastering Microsoft Internet Information Server 4 by Peter Dyson (hereinafter "Dyson") in view of Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687 hereinafter "Craig") in view of Klemets et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0013068 hereinafter "Klemets"). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Dyson with the teaching of Craig and Klemets because slide display commands allow users to control the order of the slides, and time indexing the plurality of deltaframes and keyframes permits synchronization for display at the client computer at predetermined points corresponding to the timelines of the video stream (Office Action, page 4, lines 1-7). However, as amended, it should be apparent that the claims in the present application clearly defined over the art cited, for the reasons noted below.

In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response, the following discussion focuses on amended independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. However, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816 Fax: (425) 646-6314

With regard to amended step (a) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Craig generates slide display commands corresponding to said slide triggering events, for controlling display of said plurality of presentation slides (Office Action, page 3, lines 17-19). However, significant differences exist between Craig and applicants' step (a) concerning the definition, generation, and storage of a slide display command. Applicants define a slide display command as follows:

> In addition to providing the ASF streaming content to the attendees' computers, the system also coordinates the display of the HTML presentation slide files on the attendees' computers so that each slide is displayed and animated in conjunction with the display and animation of the slide during the live broadcast. This function is performed by slide display commands (i.e., ***HTML script commands***) that are ***generated in real-time*** and ***embedded into the ASF stream.*** The slide script commands are decoded in the attendees' computers to cause an appropriate slide display and/or animation to occur in synchrony with the live presentation. Further details of this process are described below (Emphasis added, see applicants' specification, page 29, lines 20-27).

Thus, slide display commands are HTML script commands that are generated during the live presentation, and not generated either before or after the live presentation. Also, these commands are embedded or stored in the ASF stream until decoding during playback by the clients.

In contrast, unlike applicants' HTML script commands, Craig utilizes an ordered list of URLs that define the totality of the slide presentation (Craig, column 3, lines 9-11). URLs are not equivalent to HTML script commands. And unlike applicants' slide commands that are generated during the live presentation, Craig teaches providing a list of predefined set of slides that may be "perused at the student's preferred pace or order" (Craig, column 10, lines 3-8). Hence, Craig teaches away from using embedded slide commands, instead providing lists of slides that enable the student to be in control of changing slides and even control the order in which the slides are viewed, independent of the lecturer – if desired. Finally, storage of the URL is in a list where Craig's student applets receive updates to the ordinal value of the URL in the predefined list (Craig, column 3, lines 20-27) instead of decoding an embedded script command. Thus, Craig neither teaches nor suggests generating slide

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816 Fax: (425) 646-6314

display commands corresponding to triggering events *captured in real time during the presentation when presented live*, for controlling display of a plurality of presentation slides.

With regard to amended step (c) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Klemets teaches a live content being captured as a plurality of video frames comprising a plurality of keyframes and deltaframes and (c) time indexing the plurality of keyframes and deltaframes to enable synchronization of displayable events (Office Action, page 3, lines 20-22). However, a significant difference exists between Klemets and applicants' step (c) concerning how time indexing is performed. First, applicants perform time indexing automatically as described below:

> An exemplary timing sequence is now described with reference to a timeline 1707 comprising various timing marks, as shown in the Figure. A frameset comprising 15 video frames, and a corresponding audio waveform is produced in accordance with each of the timing marks. In the timing sequence, a script command for triggering the display of slide 1 is embedded into the stream 8 seconds after the start of the presentation. As a result, this script command will have an inherent time stamp of 8 seconds. In a similar fashion, a script command for displaying slide 2 will have an inherent time stamp of 28 seconds, and the script command for displaying slide 3 will have an inherent time stamp of 62 seconds. Assuming that a first keyframe (not shown) is encoded at 0 seconds (note that the first video frame will always be a keyframe), a keyframe 1708 is ***automatically*** encoded at 8 seconds, a keyframe 1710 is ***automatically*** encoded at 24 seconds, and a keyframe 1712 is encoded in accord with the sixth frame of a frameset 1714, due to motion of the presenter, which occurs at approximately 58 seconds (Emphasis added, see applicants' specification, page 42, lines 6-18).

In contrast, even if Klemets provides for doing time indexing, it must be performed ***manually*** by the user. Specifically, a time hairline spanning time tracks provides a designer with a visual aid to select an appropriate time, displayed in time indicator, for synchronizing a displayable event (Klemets, paragraph 0052). In addition, the designer may view frames in the video window for referencing and selecting time stamps for use in generating annotation streams (Klemets,

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816 Fax: (425) 646-6314

paragraph 0050). Thus, Klemets neither teaches nor suggests ***automatically*** time indexing the plurality of keyframes and deltaframes as the live content is captured to enable synchronization of the slide display commands with the live content.

With regard to amended independent Claim 9, which is directed towards a method for reproducing on a viewing computer a presentation that was previously presented live, the definition, generation, and storage of a slide display command and the ***automatic*** time indexing function make this claim patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Craig and in view of Klemets for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with applicants' Claim 1.

With regard to amended independent Claims 16 and 20, which are directed towards a system for recording a live presentation including a predefined content portion having a plurality of presentation slides that are displayed in response to slide triggering events during the live presentation, the definition, generation, and storage of a slide display command and the ***automatic*** time indexing function make this claim patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Craig and in view of Klemets, for reasons similar to those noted above in connection with applicants' Claim 1.

With regard to amended independent Claim 24, which is directed towards a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for recording a live presentation having a predefined content portion, the definition, generation, and storage of a slide display command and the ***automatic*** time indexing function also make this claim patentably distinguishable over Dyson in view of Craig and in view of Klemets for the reasons discussed above in connection with applicants' Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, and 21-23 depend from independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24 which are patentable for the reasons discussed above. Because dependent claims inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend, dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, and 21-23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1, 9, 16, 20, and 24. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-15, 17-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dyson in view of Craig in view of Klemets should be withdrawn.

In consideration of the amendments and Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims remaining in this application define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816 Fax: (425) 646-6314

any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Anderson

Ronald M. Anderson
Registration No. 28,829

RMA/SKM:lrg

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 30, 2004.

Date: September 30, 2004

Kathy Pare

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816 Fax: (425) 646-6314